



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,545	01/25/2007	Anthony J. Abbate	112129.411USPC	9067
41551	7590	12/09/2008	EXAMINER	
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC			NGUYEN, DINH Q	
701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092			3752	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/09/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,545	ABBATE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dinh Q. Nguyen	3752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/05/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 18, 25-27, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rohs et al.

Rohs et al. discloses a device for dispensing a multi-component composition comprising: a plurality of fluid component inlets 2/9, at least one carrier fluid inlet 9, a diffuser surface 12, an outlet 16.

With respect to claims 25-27, 37-38 the apparatus shown by Rohs et al. is capable of performing the method or steps recited in the claims

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 18, 25-27, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grogan et al.

Grogan et al. discloses a device for dispensing a multi-component composition comprising: a plurality of fluid component inlets 19/21, at least one carrier fluid inlet 32/33, a diffuser surface 57, an outlet 64 (see figure 4), the dispenser 10 could be adapted to contain a variety of liquids.

With respect to claims 25-27, 37-38, the apparatus shown by Grogan et al. is capable of performing the method or steps recited in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 16-17, 19-24, 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohs et al. in view of Gardner.

Rohs et al. discloses all the limitations of the claims except for a slot shaped orifice.

However, Gardner teaches a multi-component dispensing device such as polyester resins and catalysts with a slot shaped orifice 210 (see figure 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Rohs et al. with a slot shaped orifice as suggested by Gardner. Doing so would provide a fan spray pattern (see column 8, line 61.

With respect to claims 15, 17, 19-24, 30-32, 34, 35, Rohs et al. in view of Gardner teaches all the limitations of the claims except for the different types of multi-component compositions. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the device of Rohs et al. in view of Gardner with the different types of multi-component compositions. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either claimed different multi-component compositions or the Rohs et al. and Gardner's multi-component compositions. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Rohs et al. and Gardner to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15, 17, 19-24, 30-32, 34, 35. Furthermore, the device of Rohs et al. or Gardner capable of dispensing any types of multi-component compositions.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to show the art with respect to a multi-components dispensing device: Breslau et al., Behar et al., and Sweeton.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on 571-272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dinh Q Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752

dqn